



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

R.T.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/608,302 06/30/00 WILSON

G MEMC-98-4650

000321 IM52/0928
SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS MO 63102

EXAMINER

KUNEMUND, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1765

DATE MAILED:

09/28/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/608,302

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examin r

Robert M Kunemund

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ✓ ✓
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. It is unclear in claim 2 as to when the epitaxial layer is grown and in what relationship to the wafer the growth has during processing.

Claim 3 depends upon itself and it is unclear as to which claim it does depend and there is no antecedent basis for the phrase "said coating" found in claim 3.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1765

Claims 1 to 15 and 18 to 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falster (PCT 38675) et al or Huber et al both in view of Goodwin et al..

The Falster et al and Huber et al references teach a method and apparatus for denuding a silicon wafer. A silicon wafer is placed in a heating chamber and heated to temperatures above 1175° c. The wafer is then cooled to temperatures below 800 °c at cooling rates, which can vary and are 10°c/sec or higher, note Falster pages 14-15, Huber et al entire reference. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the removal of the heated wafer to another chamber. However, the Goodwin et al reference teaches moving heated wafer from one chamber to another via a Bernoulli wand, note entire reference. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Falster et al and Huber et al references by the teachings of the Goodwin et al reference to transfer the heated wafer in order to place the wafer in a cooling only chamber increasing control over the wafer.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falster (PCT 38675) et al or Huber et al both in view of Goodwin et al..

The Falster et al, Huber et al and Goodwin et al references are relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differ from the instant claims in the heat source. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentations the optimum,

Art Unit: 1765

operable heating means in the Falster et al and Huber et al references in order to uniformly heat the wafer creating uniform properties.

Examiner's Remarks

The remaining references are merely cited of interest as showing the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Kunemund whose telephone number is 703-308-1091. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ben Utech can be reached on 703-308-3636. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3599 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

RMK
September 25, 2001



ROBERT KUNEMUND
PRIMARY EXAMINER